

THE
INDIAN POLITICAL TANGLE
AND THE WAY OUT

BY

R. V. RAO, M.A., B.T.

Professor and Head of the Department of Economics and Politics.
Dharmendrasinhji College, Rajkot.

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
LAMINGTON ROAD
BOMBAY-7

TO

DR. R. K. YAJNIK, M.A., PH.D. (London)
PRINCIPAL, DHARMENDRASINHJI COLLEGE, RAJKOT
IN TOKEN OF GRATEFUL REGARD AND ESTEEM
FOR HIS DEEP ERUDITION

P R E F A C E

The mind of every thinking man in India is occupied with the problem of India's future constitution and an attempt is made in the following pages to examine critically some salient features of the said problem, so that the reader may reach his own conclusions in an unbiased way. There is a sense of frustration in the country at the present deadlock. It is gratifying to find that some of our eminent countrymen are showing commendable earnestness to find a way out of it. For this there must be well-informed public opinion based upon up-to-date knowledge and sound judgment.

This book has grown out of my occasional contributions to various leading Indian journals. The irresistible persuasion of some of my friends, coupled with the favourable reception accorded to my previous works by the Indian press and the reading public alike, has induced me to bring this book out. I deem that my labours are more than repaid if this book can impress upon the minds of the readers the need for a realistic approach to our political problem, a solution to which, has to be found out not only in the interests of our country, but also for the sake of humanity at large.

Before I conclude, I have to thank my old teacher, Professor M. Venkata Rangayya, M.A., who gave me

valuable help in preparing the manuscript for the press. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Shri G. R. Bhatkal, Proprietor of the Popular Book Depot, Bombay for having undertaken the publication of this book, when publication of books is none too easy.

R. V. RAO.

Rajkot,
15th May, 1944.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I Unity In Indian Politics...	1
II The Problem of Minorities	7
III Whither Pakistan	12
IV The Indian Political Deadlock	17
V The Indian Political Situation	20
VI The Future Constitution of India	24
VII Conclusion	31
Appendix A: Responsible State	35
,, B: Failure of Representative Democracy	38

CHAPTER I

UNITY IN INDIAN POLITICS

It is often pointed out that, from the standpoint of politics centrifugal or disruptive forces have always been strong in India, and consequently attempts made in the past to bring all the country under one government had no enduring success. This is illustrated by the fate of all empires, the Mayuran Empire, the Gupta and Harsha Empires, the medieval Rajput Empires, the Afghan, Mughal and finally the Maratha Empire.

But it does not mean that centripetal forces are totally absent here. The ideal of all the ancient Indian rulers was the establishment of political unity in the country. The tradition of the Chakravartin, the Digvijaya of Aswamedha, the celebration of Rajasuya, and the traditional science of politics, with principles for governing dependencies and for organising the imperial administration, all these clearly point to the fact that centripetal forces were equally strong.

The forces working in favour of unity were very many. We have in the first place the geographical unity of India with natural boundaries separating the country from the neighbouring countries. In ancient times there was one religion or Dharma. In addition, we had a common type of social organisation. Added to these there was a common language and literature. We had a common educational system. There was a

distinct type of thought and life in India which has endured through the centuries and has been the greatest contribution of India to the world. Further, the ancient Indians, wherever they were, had common sacred shrines like the famous Viswanath Temple at Benares and the temple at Rameshwari.

It was nothing strange that those people in the ancient past, who had so many bonds of unity, should make attempts to establish political unity also.

An important circumstance which kept up this unity was the looseness of the political or imperial organisation. The conquered territories were indeed self-governing dependencies, merely paying tribute. The imperial rule did not mean oppression or tyranny by a distant authority. There was little interference with local customs and free opportunity was given for the development of the genius of the people in each subordinate kingdom or province.

The success that was attained in India in the direction of political unity is not to be determined with reference to what has been possible in the 19th or 20th century with vast improvements in the means of communication and in scientific warfare; but with reference to the achievements of the people in the past, in other parts of the world, in their attempts to establish one political authority over areas as extensive as India, which is aptly spoken of as a sub-continent. Students of history can consider the area of the Greek or the Persian Empire. We should note the relative area over which they ruled, how long they ruled, what ups and downs they had to face and what memories they left behind.

But it is to be recognised that there were at all

times equally active forces of political disruption. The very extent of the country, and the existence of physical barriers between one part and another, these account for the operation of disruptive forces. The imperial tradition itself encouraged every ambitious ruler to go on Dīgvijaya. This brought about the break-up of the existing unity and the rise of another in its place. We have to consider also the loose political organisation and the consequent ease which the yoke of the supreme ruler could be overthrown.

Even the period of Muslim rule did not witness better success in the achievement of political unity, although under some Muslim rulers the supremacy of Delhi extended over nearly the whole of the country. But the Muslim polity had two additional elements of weakness, which were not to be found in ancient Indian polity. One was the tradition of autocracy or despotism both at the centre and in the parts ; and the other the religious differences between the rulers and the ruled, unaccompanied, in most cases, by religious toleration. The anarchy that the country had to face in the 18th century was much worse than at any other period in the history of India.

By 1858, political unity was achieved under the British with the suppression of the Indian Mutiny. It has been in existence for eighty years—not indeed a long period in the history of India.

It may be noted that, the British were not successful in establishing a uniform kind of political regime over the whole country. They had to tolerate the existence of the Indian States. The whole country could not be converted into a single province, directly administered by the central government. Thus, we

find that the degree of political unity established in the 20th century is not different from that which has always been traditional in the land.

It is too soon to pronounce judgment as to whether the British have been able to conquer completely and finally the forces of disruption. While they have strengthened the centripetal forces by improving the means of communication, keeping an efficient army and establishing a uniform system of courts and justice, they have at the same time introduced a fresh complication, as their rule is felt to be a foreign rule. Foreigners have invaded India, but when once they conquered, they settled in the country and made common cause with the people. It is this contrast that is responsible for little national feeling as we have at the present time.

By the Government of India Act of 1935 the provinces were given autonomy. But the attempt to introduce democracy and majority rule in a country where there is a cleavage between the Hindus and the Moslems, brings in another disruptive factor into the situation. The object of the British policy has been the unification of the whole country on a federal basis. Just at this time Mr. Jinnah brought forward his Pakistan scheme. It postulates the division of the country into two parts to be controlled by governments independent of one another, owning no responsibility to a central organisation. Thus, no central authority can co-ordinate or unite these two separate entities.

This is not a federal plan. The scheme is one of complete political disintegration. Mr. Jinnah thinks that he wants his Pakistan because he feels that the

rights of the Moslems as minorities are trampled down by the majority community. Similarly, Hindus also may not be prepared to live under the control of the Moslem State because their scheme envisages the absence of any central control even in times of grave crisis and emergency.

In the country where the forces of disintegration are very strong, such schemes do not stand a moment's scrutiny. It appears as if his ambition is to create a Moslem India within India itself and such proposals deserve to be nipped in the bud. His formula can never settle the communal problem; on the other hand, it brings in its train centrifugal forces which will undo the work of the British during the past two centuries. If Mr. Jinnah were to succeed, it would lead to the political vivisection of India. It might lead to political disruption, in the sense that instead of one central government, we might have as many British governments as there are provinces and states, each province being directly under the control of the British Crown. The federal idea is now in the background and it will be no wonder if the idea of paramountcy as now applied to the States is extended to the provinces also.

In considering this problem, we should never forget the cultural unity of India. There is a distinct type of thought and life in India which has endured through the centuries and has been the greatest contribution of India to the world. We must, indeed, make a new approach to national unity. In our discussion of the problem, we should consider that we all belong to the same country. The one centripetal force that should bind us together is the land of India. The cultural

unity of India as a state, whose integrity and independence must be the supreme concern of every community that calls itself Indian is to be the ideal of every one of us.

Another disturbing factor in the situation is the existence of the Indian states which are mostly autocratic. They are also not enthusiastic about the federal ideal because it is not possible to have a combination of unadulterated autocracy in the units and democracy at the centre.

The object of the British policy should be to bring about Indian unity on a federal basis. In this case, central unity will be based on a compromise between the various provinces and States. It is in relation to the circumstances mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs that the value of the federal experiment is to be determined. If there is to be political unity in India it can only be on a federal basis. A federal government alone can harmonise the antagonistic factors of communalism, provincialism and the autonomy of the Indian states.

The form of government should thus undergo transformation in the federal direction. Political unity is to be based on a compromise between the communities and a scheme intended to protect their cultural autonomy.

Hope of the continuance of political unity lies only in the subordination of vested interests to national interests. It is earnestly hoped that the government will not yield to the disruptive forces but will proceed with the task of bringing about complete political unity. This is necessary for establishing internal security and for checking

external aggression. If it does not arrest these forces or if it fails in achieving this, history will repeat itself and disruptive factors will reign supreme, the evils of which are too well known to be repeated.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM OF MINORITIES

If any one were to put the question, as to what the central problem of Indian politics is, one can readily say that it is the problem of minorities. As the Simon Commission Report says : "India is a land of minorities and the spirit of toleration is absent." The Commission, indeed, regretted the absence of a settlement between the communities as stumbling block to the establishment of self-government in India.

The problem of minorities has been attracting the attention of the people and the Government since a decade. The important parties which are vitally concerned with this problem are the Hindus and the Moslems. The Moslems, it is well known, differ from the Hindus in religion. They number about 70 millions.

It is well known that the Hindu-Muslim problem has come to stay on account of several factors. Historically, the Hindu society was not able to assimilate or absorb the Moslem culture because by the time Islam came to India with a highly developed philo-

sophy, its monotheism presented a contrast to the polytheism of the Hindu pantheon. It is of course true that social forces were cutting across religious cleavages. Still separatist tendencies prompted the starting of organisations on communal lines.

From the political point of view, the search for security, political, religious, cultural, etc. generated the spirit of separation which ultimately culminated in the demand for Pakistan or separation. Students of Indian constitutional history can very well recollect how they demanded separate electorates and how the institution of separate electorates accentuated the already existing antagonisms. Dr. Beni Prasad in his work "Hindu Moslem Questions" rightly says that it enfeebled the capacity of every group to protect its interests in the national context. The suffrage was extended and the ignorant masses were thus made the tools of communal gerrymandering. Thus we find that since 1928, Indian politics deteriorated into a scramble for power.

The other minorities do not take much interest in this problem, since they feel that it is better to throw their lot with the majority community. It is well known that there is a sense of cultural and political inequality in the minds of the Moslems and there is also the fear that they may not get a fair deal from the majority community.

In India, we have the existence of religious, racial and linguistic minorities. It is well known, that the co-operation of all these communities is the *sine-qua-non* of the success of any form of democratic government in India. Till recently, the principle of separate electorate has been tried to solve the problem, but

instead of solving the problem, the grant of separate electorates has accentuated communal jealousies. The principle of separate electorates is fraught with disastrous consequences, as it divides the nation into water-tight compartments. Many of the British Statesmen, including Mr. Amery the present Secretary of State for India, refer to the absence of Communal settlement which is a standing obstacle in the way of granting Self-Government to India. But here one cannot but state the fact that the British should never have granted separate electorates to any community and the problem of minorities really arises from the date, when Minto conceded the right of preferential treatment to the Moslems.

The Moslem League sometime ago appointed a committee to inquire into the dismemberment of India. It is its aim to frustrate all the efforts of the British for two centuries in a direction of establishing political unity in India. If there is one lesson which the present war has taught it is the danger of the existence of small states like Denmark, Poland, etc. which fell before Hitler like a pack of cards.

In all solutions of the problem, one should never forget the fact that there is a distinct type of thought and life in India which has been enduring through centuries and which has been the greatest contribution of India to the world. Indeed, several suggestions have been put forward for a new approach to national unity. We should never forget that we all belong to the land of India and that we should all contribute our quota to the greatness of India. We may belong to different races and religions but it is the land and our love towards it, that should bind us all together.

Indeed, none of us should try to dismember India. It must be undivided and one.

Here, it may be stated that the object of the British policy should be to bring about political unity on a federal basis. It is only a federal government that can harmonise the antagonistic forces of communalism, provincialism and the autonomy of the Indian States. The British Government should declare in unequivocal terms that the problem of Indian constitution can be considered only on the basis of an undivided India.

The cultural autonomy of the minorities must, indeed, be recognised. The minorities should be given the right to the acquisition of nationality, to use their mother tongue and improve their culture and literature. The racial problem of Canada was solved only in this way, and this method may be tried in India with advantage.

Fundamental rights, guaranteeing elementary and common rights like right to equality of treatment in the eye of law, to freedom of speech, etc. to all people, should be incorporated in the constitution.

Even so far as legislation is concerned, we can have an arrangement wherein matters of common concern will be decided by the general legislature and matters affecting the religion and culture of the minorities

may be left to the decision of members who belong to that particular minority.

In the above cases, one objection may be raised and that is what the minorities should do if that they have a just grievance against the actions of the majority. An arrangement can be made when minorities can prefer appeals to the judges of the supreme court and their decision shall be made final. The

upreme court of the U.S.A. did much to protect the rights of individuals and our federal court can be vested with powers to deal with such cases.

The Governors' special responsibilities are to be continued. Till yesterday, many people used to condemn the Governors' special responsibilities. But it may be pointed out that it was the special power vested in the Governor of Ceylon, that saved our Indian minority in Ceylon a few years back when the legislature actually passed a measure with a view to drive the Indian minority away from that island.

Indeed, it may be pointed out that all the laws affect all the people alike and the minorities should never fail to notice that the best safeguard on which they have to depend is the goodwill of the majority community. They must identify themselves, with national aspirations. Principles of moderation and mutual confidence will have to prevail. Separate electorates can never protect the rights of the minorities. It is true, that they may secure 'die hard' representatives of the communities on the legislature but that retards the growth of democracy in India.

The minorities should recognise that just as they have rights, they have also some duties to perform. They should mix with the majority community and identify themselves with the nationalistic ideas. The protection of their just rights, then, as the late Mr. M. Briand said becomes a 'sacred duty.' All possible means on the lines suggested above should be adopted for bringing about mutual goodwill amongst the various communities.

The dawn of responsible government is postponed on the plea of communal discord. It is hoped that the

leaders of all minorities realise the gravity of the situation and contribute their share whole-heartedly to the common weal. It need not once again be mentioned, that it is the land of India that should bind us together as united we stand and divided we fail. India expects her sons and daughters to do their duty at this critical juncture in her history.

CHAPTER III

WHITHER PAKISTAN

In the previous chapter some solutions were offered for the problem of minorities in India. It has been shown that the only protection that can be depended upon, and that is really worth having, is the good-will amongst the various communities, that inhabit this vast country. All the communities have noble instincts in them, and it is no exaggeration if it is said that there is one demand common for all the people of this country, *viz.* the freedom of the country.

The Government of India Act of 1935, envisaged the establishment of a federal form of Government for this country and a beginning was made by the grant of autonomy to the provinces. Somehow or other the federal idea is now in the background and two years of working of Provincial Autonomy has brought into forefront several new schemes, not for the political unification of the country under a strong Central Government, but for the division of the country into a number of loosely knit units.

The Moslems all of a sudden thought that they should have a separate state, where they would have opportunities of "self-expression." To justify their new deal they had to show that under provincial autonomy, pure and simple, their legitimate rights were jeopardised and the burden of the song of the Pirpur Report was to prove that Moslems were neglected or even ill-treated in provinces, where Hindu Ministries (Congress Ministries) were functioning. They have tried to make out a case, that political partition of the country is the only solution of the problem.

The Moslem League and its supporters are too busy to prove that "India is not a country but a continent" and that the idea of a composite nation should be "banished from our minds." In consequence of such views, several schemes have been put forth for the political vivisection of India. They are "The Sikandar Scheme," "The Latif Scheme," "The Scheme of Aligarh Professors," etc. All these schemes start from the same hypothesis, namely, that there is no single nation in India and the gulf between one nation and another is unbridgeable. They, therefore, suggest that regions should be constituted, with necessary readjustments so that Moslems may carve out independent zones for themselves.

Here they curiously forget the fact that from a geographical and political point of view, India is an indivisible whole and after all though we may belong to different races and religions, yet all of us inhabit only one country and that is the land of India. Attempts have been made by vested interests to magnify differences and the myth of the two nations' theory has been made much of. The anxiety of some

of them is the separation of Moslem India from Hindu India.

Of all the schemes, put forward for the political vivisection of India, the Pakistan scheme attracts our attention. The Moslem League prepared a scheme to divide India into Moslem and Non-Moslem States. According to their scheme, Sind, Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab and Delhi and perhaps some portions of U.P. will form a contiguous North Indian Moslem States. The League is also anxious that the Nizam should be ceded back his former territories.

It is at least something that all sections recognise the need for a central authority. Though Mr. Jinnah says that his scheme is not final and though the ex-Viceroy wrote to the Hindu Mahasabha, that Pakistan question, was not a 'live issue,' yet all of us should consider its implications and its repurcussions on the politics of this country. Though it may not be a 'live' issue now, it may become a live issue soon as Mr. Jinnah says that he will even die for Pakistan.

The scheme, unfortunately, is based upon the wrong notion that Hindus and Moslems can never unite. As some Moslem leaders like the late Sikander Hyat Khan and Fazlul Huq did not yet completely identify themselves with the scheme, and as some Moslem leaders have openly condemned the scheme and opined that far from solving the communal problem, it will accentuate communal jealousies, there is still some hope of a solution of the communal problem on other lines.

In evaluting this scheme of Pakistan, we should consider some of its implications. The Moslem States,

which the League is anxious to carve out, will be deficit states and they will have to depend upon subsidies from the Central Government. Economically, of what use is Pakistan, when the people therein cannot make both ends meet ?

Another implication is, whether by having Moslem zones and Hindu zones, we will not be encouraging other minorities to agitate for their 'stans.' The net result is that we will have a number of loosely knit units. All the schemes are silent as regards the powers of the Central Government. It appears as if they want more powers, including residuary powers for the provinces..

Another thing that we have to note is that if Kashmir is to be included in the Moslem zones on the plea that Muslims form a majority, then Hyderabad should be under the Hindu zone on the same plea.

Politically, there will be serious difficulties regarding defence, etc. If there is one lesson which we can draw from the present war, it is the danger of having small states. The question of customs revenue also should be considered. If Calcutta is to be under the control of the Moslem zone, then there will be diversion of trade to Vizagapatam harbour. This will be to the detriment of Moslems.

In all discussions of the problem, it is often forgotten that all of us live in India. Indeed, there has been the evolution of a common culture which has been at work during the past five or six centuries. Further the play and interplay of different regions and cultures in India, in the course of her long and eventful history have led to an ever-increasing unity in language, culture, art, architecture, and indeed in

every sphere of life. The ideal of a number of Indian rulers was the unity of India. An effort was made in the past to have a cultural synthesis. It is hoped that our communal leaders will not fail to consider this.

Some people opine that if the scheme of Pakistan is not accepted, we may have to accept something worse than this 'pet child' of the communal award. The need of the hour is a new approach to national unity. If freedom is won, it is of equal advantage to one and all. At the present time, we are all under the grip of poverty and there is nothing like 'Hindu poverty' or 'Moslem poverty.' Hope lies only in finding out a solution based on understanding and sympathy. Intellectual ingenuity is not required but what is essential, as Sir S. Radhakrishnan said the other day is, an understanding of life fostered by social activity, clash of personality, and interchange of opinion. This is more important than intellectual gifts.

We should try to eschew religion from politics, and it can easily be seen that, if we are able to have an equal place in the comity of nations, then there need not be any misapprehension, regarding the protection of the rights, culture, religion, etc. of the minorities.

If public opinion does not assert itself, schemes for several other 'stans' also may show their head, and this will end in 'Gulamistan' (slave land). It is earnestly hoped that, our leaders will view the whole question dispassionately and arrive at an agreement regarding the future constitution of India. If public opinion does not assert itself, only a few leaders may try to exploit their own ends, under the garb of the rights of their own community. That is why Professor

Harold J. Laski wrote in one of his books 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.'

CHAPTER IV

THE INDIAN POLITICAL DEADLOCK

It is so unfortunate that things are allowed to drift and that no attempts are made to solve the present deadlock. Many expected that the Conferences of non-party leaders would be able to do something in the matter and the Government also would pay heed to their resolutions but Mr. Amery rejected even their minimum demands. It is also unfortunate that much is made of communal disharmony which is taken as an excuse for not ending the present deadlock.

The present writer had the opportunity of discussing the implications of Pakistan agitation in previous chapters and considering the economics of Pakistan, one finds that Moslems do not stand to gain. Indeed, in the course of an article on Pakistan published in the *Twentieth Century* Sir T. B. Sapru wrote "For the British generally, to agree to the demand for the dissection of India will be an act of black treachery to India." The history of India of the 18th century has been referred to by Mr. Amery, to serve as a warning. What is required is a strong Central Government. Once the strength of the Central Government is gone, disruptive and disintegrating forces will reign supreme.

Mr. Jinnah doubted the *bona fides* of the Bombay Conference resolution in 1941 and began to argue that

the Bombay Conference was convened at the instigation of the Congress and Hindu Mahasabha leaders. Sir T. B. Sapru lost no time in refuting this statement. At last, Mr. Jinnah had to remain silent. The Moslem League had accepted Paikstan as an article of faith. Here, a passing reference may also be made to the controversy between Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Mr. Jinnah. Dr. Prasad was justified in saying that unless the whole scheme with its details is put before the Congress, the Congress cannot express an opinion.

Mr. Amery still thinks of the August offer and throws the whole blame for the present impasse on the failure of the various parties to arrive at a settlement. Even Europeans like Mr. Arthur Moore, the late Editor of the *Statesman* felt that it is high time that the problem was solved and, indeed, wanted that the Viceroy as the 'man on the spot' should be given more powers. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce repudiated his views and said that they would stand by the August offer. Indeed Mr. Moore was anxious that the gravity of the situation should be realised. Silence would have been golden if the Bengal Chamber was not able to make any contribution for the solution of the deadlock.

Mr. Fazlul Haq, the late Bengal Premier saw the late Viceroy and placed before him his views on the solution of the deadlock. As usual, it is reported, he suggested the formation of national governments and also a Round Table Conference to decide the question. We have no information as to what the Viceroy had to say in the matter. Interviews, of course, are no guarantee for solution. One thing may be said that there had been some differences of opinion between Mr.

Fazlul Huq and other extremist Muslim League members which led to his resignation. One need not be mention here about his vacillation and jerks of policy. But anyway, he says that he will try to the very end to see that the deadlock is solved. Further he admits that the constitution is to be based on love and not strife. Indeed, he is reported to have emphasised the 'extreme necessity of associating Indians with the central as well as provincial administrations to a large extent in order to make the executive as representative as possible.'

One fact however remains. Whether it is from the point of view of war effort or the country's future, it is high time that a new approach should be made for the solution of the deadlock. Mr. Amery cannot go on saying that the responsibility rests with the parties themselves to arrive at an agreement. It is admitted on all sides that instead of asking the leaders to come to an agreement, it is better for the Government to come forward with proposals to end deadlock. Then other parties can consider the proposals. Even otherwise if the parties arrive at an agreement, what guarantee is there that their resolutions will be accepted ?

The best way to end the deadlock is to consult Mahatmaji who is the best friend of the Britain in India. It is hoped that things will not be allowed to drift and the Government will come forward with proposals for the solution. The Government should not at all support proposals for the political vivisection of India. Indeed, one of the greatest benefits which the British rule has conferred upon us is unity and a strong Central Government to combat disruptive tendencies.

INDIAN POLITICAL SITUATION

One of the important problems that attracts public notice as well as the attention of the publicists of this country is the present political situation which calls for prompt action. The meeting of the British Premier and President Roosevelt and their historic eight-point declaration for fallen races have aroused great expectations. But unfortunately the absence of any reference to this country chilled what enthusiasm people had in British professions of grant of freedom to India.

On one side, the Congress is still out of office and is in wilderness and no attempt has been made to bring about a rapprochement. Indeed, it has been the opinion of some veteran Congressmen that the Congress should return to office. Whether it is desirable or not one is led to believe that the present international and national situation is such that a realistic approach should be made to solve the Indian political problem and also for ending the present impasse. There are many who honestly believe that there is a great need for the revision of Congress policy. But it may be said that unless it is made perfectly clear that India will be given an equal footing in the comity of nations immediately after the war it may not be possible for the Congress to revise the policy. It is a good thing His Excellency, the Viceroy in his address to the joint legislatures on 17th February, 1944 observed "There is an important element which stands aloof. I recognise how much ability and highmindedness it contains . . .

I should like to have the co-operation of this element in solving the present and future problems of India." But unless the Government takes the initiative in the matter, nothing worthwhile can be done.

In the previous chapters, reference has been made to the demand for Pakistan and an attempt has been made to show how Pakistan agitation is fraught with disastrous consequences. When representatives were recruited for the new Executive Council and the National Defence Council, members of the Moslem League were nominated even though the Muslim League was not ready to co-operate with the Government in this matter unless its demands were conceded. Mr. Amery lost no time in proclaiming that these members 'regardless of party leaders and in defiance of party discipline' came forward to work for India's defence. The proceedings of the Muslim League at the session held at Bombay in 1941 and the consequent resignations of Muslim League members from the Defence Council clearly show that even the Muslim League is not satisfied with the attitude of the Government. Thus, it is clear that the present Defence Council cannot claim to enjoy the support of even the Muslim League. In taking stock of the proceedings of the various sessions of the Muslim League, one is really shocked to find that there is still an attempt to levy irresponsible charges on the Congress and the Hindus. Indeed, the allegations are 'wild and reckless.' Unfortunately the leaders of the Muslim League are not considering the consequences of libelling the Congress and the Hindus. It only postpones the fulfilment of our cherished ideals. In fact there is nothing like Hindu swaraj and Moslem swaraj and what is wanted

is a morsel of food for the dumb toiling millions of India.

It is really a good thing the Hindu Mahasabha is taking a lively interest in the politics of the country. They are not allowing the interests of the Hindus to go by default.

The Atlantic Charter tells us something about the tasks of post-war settlement. It promises to lead the downtrodden races of Europe to the high road of freedom and justice. This will not give us relief because there is no mention of India. It is desirable that there should be an explicit declaration to the effect that the Indian problem also will be viewed in such a spirit after the war. Further Mr. Churchill in his broadcast on the 'New Order' refers to the vanquished people of Europe. The problem of subject races in the British Commonwealth of Nations is to be viewed in its true perspective. In the new world order foreshadowed by Mr. Churchill and others there must be great scope for justice and fairplay. Indeed, elementary comforts are not the birth right of only the 'large' nations but they are necessary for one and all. That is the desideratum at the present time.

Indeed the recent non-party leaders' conference made it clear to the Government that only a National Government can successfully help the Government in war effort and that India's status after the war should be explicitly made clear. As Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru says 'it is not understandable that while Britain almost every day declares she is fighting for the freedom of small nations she has remained silent over the Indian question.'

A National Government alone can effectively mobi-

ilse the resources of the country to resist the Nazi and Japanese menace. This cannot be difficult if an honest attempt is made to end the present impasse by defining the relation between both India and England after the war. In the words of Sir Tej Bahadur 'We want equality with Britain.' When the whole safety and integrity of India are at stake, people with representative character alone can meet the new situation. It is earnestly hoped that steps will be taken in this direction.

Attempts should be made to bring about communal harmony, peace and goodwill. Irresponsible statements, speeches and the like cannot take us far. One is tempted to say that all the communities should lay their cards openly on the table and effectively contribute to the solution of the problem after exchanging their views. The present writer entirely agrees with the view of Mr. Munshi that the nation is 'at bay' and we should all try to establish communal concord.

More than ever before, there is a great need for a realistic approach to the political problems of the country. It is the consensus of opinion that Nazi tyranny and Japanese flop should be crushed so that we can lay the foundation of a new world order. That does not mean that the interests of the country should be sacrificed and that we should not demand that the same principles for which the present war is fought, should be applied to India at least after the war. It is earnestly hoped that the eminent and patriotic executive councillors will convince the Government that a new approach should be made to the solution of the Indian problem.

A perusal of the previous paragraphs, convinces

one of the consequences of following a policy of drift. What is required is an explicit declaration that India also will be given an equal place in the comity of nations. We have arrived at a stage when there is a great need for brave decision and prompt action. No time should be lost to get the support of Mahatmaji and thereby the Congress. It is earnestly hoped that a new approach will be made to the solution of the Indian political problem. One cannot deny that there is a certain amount of impatience amongst the people and no time should be lost to get hold of the situation and create confidence in the people regarding the *bona fides* of British promises.

i

CHAPTER VI

THE FUTURE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Though it is very difficult to foreshadow the types of government that are in store for India, yet one can understand the trends of it from the way in which political parties and leaders are viewing the question. During the past few years, several schemes for the solution of the present deadlock have been propounded. A recent scheme suggests that India should be divided into five dominions as under :—(1) The Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind, (2) Bombay, (3) U.P., Bihar and C.P., (4) Madras, and (5) Bengal, Assam and Orissa.

According to this scheme, these dominions will be

autonomous in their internal affairs and a Central Government will be set up for the administration of laws and affairs common to all the dominions. As it is, the Central Government is expected to administer defence, foreign affairs, currency and railways. The Central Government will consist of representatives sent by the dominions. The dominions will have the power of cessation from the Central Government and re-entering it at will. Residuary powers will vest with 'the dominions.

Though it is thought that by this way the Hindu-Moslem question will be solved, yet it cannot but be said that this scheme sets in motion the Pakistan ideology, though in a different way. The scheme suggests that Bengal and Assam on one side and the Punjab, N.-W. Frontier and Sind on the other should be carved out as separate dominions. They virtually form the Pakistan units adumbrated in the Lahore resolution of the Moslem League.

Further the Central Government that is visualised will not have real powers. At any moment any dominion may secede. Really the scheme envisages only a confederate and not a federal government. Here we have to profit by the example of the American confederation just after it got independence. Another recent example is the failure of the League of Nations due to member states having the right to secede at will. In any political system we have to give the Central Government(or any department of administration) real powers so that it can discharge its functions efficiently. The Central Government should not be a creature of the dominions. Economic and financial, no less than defensive considerations, tend to make for

unity. Currency and exchange, customs and tariffs, transport and communication, commerce and industry and defence, all render necessary the establishment of a strong and powerful Central Government.

It should not, however, be thought that the present writer is against granting autonomy to the provinces. On the other hand, he advocates that they should be granted the fullest amount of autonomy consistent with national ideals. That is why we prefer the federal type of government, where we will have union between the centre and the parts and not a merger.

In a country, where the forces of disintegration are very strong, we should see that no scheme which is likely to lead to the political disruption of India is accepted. Another important consideration is that any scheme should consider the position of the Indian States in the future government. Our anxiety should be to bring about Indian unity on a federal basis. In this case, central unity will be based on a compromise between the various provinces and states. A federal government alone can harmonise the antagonistic factors of communalism, provincialism and autonomy of the Indian States.

When once the units join the federation they should not have the power to secede. Here again, we should profit by the working of federations in western countries. If we want to avoid such events as the American Civil War, we should never allow this right to the federating units. On the other hand, if our ideal is to have only a confederate type of government, we must realise the dangers of a weak Central Government. The Central Government should pool as it were the resources of the country to prevent inter-

nal disorder and resist external aggression. The example of Russia may be quoted in opposition to this but conditions there are different from the conditions obtaining here. They do not have so many differences and "love of the country" is a cementing factor there.

Even so far as residuary powers are concerned, it is better they are given to the Central Government. If not, it is rather irksome to leave such question in the hands of the judiciary. At a time when the powers of interference of the federal government of the U.S.A. over the states were questioned, it was Chief Justice Marshall who upheld the legality of such interference on the part of the federal government.

If the Moslems really feel that their rights will be jeopardised at the hands of the majority, safeguards may be incorporated in the constitution. A constituent assembly may decide the details. Even the Hindu Mahasabha accepts this proposal. It may, however, be mentioned that the best safeguard will be the good-will of the majority.

The form of government should thus undergo transformation in the federal direction. Federalism, as Dicey says, is a stage on the road to unity. Cultural unity is to be based on a compromise between the communities on the basis of a scheme intended to promote their cultural autonomy. The hope of the continuance of political unity lies only in the subordination of vested interests to national interests. It is hoped that the Government will not yield to disruptive forces but proceed ahead in the task of bringing about political unity on a federal basis. This is but necessary for establishing internal security and checking external aggression. If not, past history will

repeat itself and disruptive factors reign supreme.

It is hoped that public opinion will assert the view that one centripetal force that should bind us is the land of India. The federal idea which is now in the background will, it is hoped, be taken up again. There is no use in exploiting the two-nation theory any longer.

The advantages of federation are indeed many. Federalism as is well known is a political arrangement under which the functions of Government in a state are carried on by (at least) two agencies each being supreme in a sphere of its own—the demarcation of the sphere and the exercise of supremacy not being dependent on the will of the other. A federal state differs from a confederacy of states in that the latter does not constitute itself into a state and that the confederate organ is no governmental agency from the point of view of the inhabitants in the confederate area and finally, in that the supremacy of the confederate organ depends upon the individual states. It differs from a military state in that the latter might or might not have more than one governmental agency and even when it has more than one, the sphere of one of these agencies styled local or provincial is determined by the other. It is the delimitation of powers of governmental agencies by a body over which neither has the sole control, that is the essential characteristic of a federal state and it is this that is absent in a military state.

We must also note that federal government is based on one aspect of the principle of political unity coupled with limitation of authority and the circumstances that create the need for unity are (1) defence;

when the cultural group occupies a definite area. Failure to make use of federalism for this purpose may end in tyrannical rule or even disruption.

The significance of the idea that federalism is one aspect of the principle of political union coupled with the limitation of authority is brought out when its broader implications are understood. It is then found that only when the authority in a state is organised on federal basis, that liberty and opportunity for development are possible. It of course involves the recognition that there may be more than one coercive authority, that associations other than the state command the loyalty of the citizens and that the state cannot claim a monopoly of man's loyalty, that there are aspects of man's life over which the state should not exercise control and finally that the authority of each association is limited by the purpose for which it exists. It is desirable to have homogeneity among the political institutions of the constituent units. That is why it is said that a federation between the autocratically ruled Indian States and the constitutionally ruled provinces may cause friction and deadlocks.

In the federal movement in the modern India, the motives of the British, of the Indian states, of the Moslems and the Hindus are not identical. They have a particular object in view. Stability based upon safeguards, guarantee of minimum amount of political power, the postponement of the democratic revolution, the introduction of responsible government—all these factors are in active work. Thus, we find that federalism is the only means of reconciling the differences between the provinces, Indian states and the cultural autonomy of the minorities. It alone furnishes a

unique system of co-ordination of centrifugal and centripetal forces which had their root in the history, culture, religious sentiments and economic needs of those among whom the problem arises. Indeed, the units can conduct experiments in legislation and administration without risk to federal centre. Finally, the national legislature can concentrate its attention only on important problems as the national council of the people.

To conclude, the future political system of India, should be on a federal basis which alone can solve the political riddle of India. Indeed, as His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester said the other day "Divided against herself she would be weak, united she can be great, and powerful beyond measure. Where uniformity is not to be expected, in such a vast country, where there is room for differences of races, religion and language, unity is a necessity." In fact he was aware that already strong influences are "at work, barring down the barriers of division and emphasising the fundamental unity of the country."

CHAPTER VII CONCLUSION

An attempt has been made in the previous chapters, to deal with the contemporary trends of Indian politics and in suggesting a solution for this malaise, we consider two fundamentals. Firstly the things that unite men are in the long run deeper than the things that divide them and secondly "the physiological and

psychic inheritance which constitutes the raw material of society is identical among all the Indian communities.¹ If we consider these, then any thoughtful observer has to point out that the partition of India is no remedy at all to our political problem.

Reference may be made to the solution offered by Dr. Prasad : a long range solution pertaining to general progress, an immediate political settlement and an immediate integration pertaining to cultural matters. General progress, of course, depends upon education which provides not only points of contact and common fields of action but also help to liberate the mind from narrowness and maximise opportunity so that society can be kept up at a high level and unhealthy scramble for power can be minimised. Regarding the need for immediate political settlement, it has already been emphasised in the previous chapters. Though it may be said that the conference method supplemented by impartial arbitration can be tried with advantage, the present writer holds the view that a constituent assembly alone can achieve the end.² We can have joint electorates, weightage, incorporation of fundamental rights in the constitution and finally provision for the cultural autonomy of the minorities. So far as cultural integration is concerned, its object should be tolerant understanding and creative self-expression. Denominational institutions should as far as possible be discouraged. These methods will naturally facilitate communal understanding. Above all, we should realise that unless we develop that particular faculty called sympathy, our outstanding prob-

1 This point has been ably elaborated in Dr. Beni Basad's "The Hindu-Muslim Questions" published by Minerva Book Shop Lahore.

2 For details please read, Y. G. Krishnamurti's "Constituent Assembly and Our Demand".

lems can never be solved. That alone can reinforce the unifying and harmonising influences. Dr. Ambedkar in his book "Thoughts on Pakistan" reasons that the things which separate the Moslems from the Hindus are more vital than the things that unite and holds the view that the Moslems are a nation separate from the Hindus and therefore they are entitled to a national home. He further asserts that it is ruinous for the Hindus to compell the Moslems to live with them in one united Indian nation and goes to the length of saying that they can never make a common cause with the Hindus particularly when it is a question dealing with our Moslem neighbours. Dr. Ambedkar, of course, gives us the picture of united India with communal riots running high. While it is true that this work of Dr. Ambedkar is a realistic summary of contemporary Indian communal life, one cannot but say that it does not consider the permanent elements of human nature. After all, sooner or later, we are bound to examine the problem coolly and it will be seen that 'the things that unite men are deeper than the things that divide them.'

Dr. Ambedkar pins great faith in the theory of one nation, one state and it is truly said that the present war has given it a decent burial. We have realised the dangers of small states in history and Dr. Appadorai truly says "too many states are a permanent danger to the place of mankind." We can never minimise the danger of two Moslem states on either side of it. Further there can never be good-will between Pakistan and Hindustan. Thus geography and economics are against Pakistan and His Excellency the Viceroy has done great service in emphasising the

geographical unity of India. Pakistan can never solve the political riddle of India, *viz.*, reconciliation of power with security.

A time has therefore come when the various parties will have to come to an agreement on the problem of the future constitution of India. In the political and military crisis that faces this country today, even the government should realise the need for taking the co-operation of the Indian political parties. The other alternative is to hold general elections in the provinces thus seeking the electorate's verdict on the past and ascertaining its wishes for the future.

Now that Mahatma Gandhi is released and that he is ever ready to discuss the problem with Mr. Jinnah and His Excellency the Viceroy it is hoped that the government will see that the present stalemate is ended and it may even make it clear that the question of the Indian constitutional problem can be considered only from the standpoint of a United India. Let it not be said by the future constitutional historian that any political party was responsible for the continuance of the deadlock. Let us remember the old saying

“United we stand.

Divided we fall.”

APPENDIX A

RESPONSIBLE STATE

By a responsible state, we mean that state in which the whole work is carried on the principle that it is an agent of the community, and that it is therefore answerable to the community for all its actions. It can very easily be seen that its sovereignty is very much limited, and thus the citizens have a right to question the way in which it exercises its authority.

At the present time, this responsibility is secured by defining in a constitution, the limits of the authority of the State and the methods and the machinery by which the authority is exercised. It is well known, that citizens are given the power periodically to elect the members of the legislature and in some States even the executive is made elective. The executive is made responsible to the legislatures in countries where the executive is not elective. It can very easily be seen that an independent judiciary is the *sine qua non* of securing and keeping up responsibility.

The electorate is to be educated, as their judgment regarding the work of their representatives might be instructive. That is the reason why there is now an organised campaign against illiteracy.

It is but natural, that there must be a ~~more~~ degree of economic equality. In a broadcast ~~on 21st Sept~~ Mohomad Zafrulla Khan also pleaded for a ~~faster and~~ economic order. Unless there is economic ~~equal~~ ~~order~~

participation in the political field cannot be effective. It is desirable that adequate steps should be taken to see that greater leisure is provided to all people including workers.

A representative legislature is a desideratum for securing responsibility. A corollary to it is a responsible executive. A third institution which is indispensable for securing responsibility is an independent judiciary. This is the reason why it has been truly said that the judiciary should be independent of the executive. In this connection one may casually remark that the Congress also pleaded for separation of functions, during the early period of its existence and somehow, when the Congress came to power, they could not put into practice their views in the matter.

It is admitted on all sides, that there should be universal suffrage. Till recently property was the main basis of franchise, and it is a good thing that attempts are being made in the direction of universal suffrage.

One important condition for the success of responsible government is that there should be an educated electorate. Taking India into consideration, we find that over 80% of the population are illiterate and as such the electorate cannot be expected to discharge their duties properly.

They cannot be vigilant, and consequently cannot pass judgments on the doings of the executive. Further they cannot instruct them as to what they should do. In other words, public opinion which is the deciding factor in securing responsibility, is 'neither public nor opinion.' It is hoped that steps will be taken for the spread of literacy in this country. Unfortunately progress achieved till now has been negligible, and it is

hoped that there will be acceleration of the pace of progress.

As has been already pointed out there should be a fair amount of economic equality. It is admitted that there is unequal distribution of property at the present time. As Professor Harold J. Laski wrote in one of his books "Parasitic Idleness" develops in those that have undue proportion of property. Any way, one can clearly see that in the post-war reconstruction of the world, our conceptions of private property are bound to undergo radical transformation.

Equally important is the need for freedom of the press which is aptly spoken of as the 'fourth estate.' The press should be free within limits and should be allowed to express opinions without fear or favour, consistent with national security. It may be stated that the press can educate the public so that their opinion should be instructive. If there is what is called 'gagging' of the press then it cannot discharge its functions properly.

There should also be freedom of speech. Freedom does not mean anything that one likes. It does not mean license to speak anything that one likes. It is freedom or power to express one's opinions which are aimed at securing responsibility from the State. When there is the danger of external aggression and internal insecurity, it is but natural that there should be restrictions on freedom of speech. These are exceptional cases. Other things being equal, there should be no restrictions on this fundamental right.

In the foregoing paragraphs, an attempt has been made to mention the implications of a responsible state and the methods of securing that responsibility.

Unless these conditions are present, responsibility cannot be secured effectively. Responsible government prevails only in those countries where these conditions exist. If these conditions are absent, then there will be the rule of a few individuals or one individual, and that type of government is not what is to be desired in the best interest of any country.

APPENDIX B

FAILURE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

An ideal form of government is one in which all the people exercise a share in the government of the country. In ancient times, it was possible due to the small size of all the states. They could easily meet every day and transact the day-to-day administration efficiently as was the case with the ancient city states. With the rise of the modern "Country states," it was found that it is impossible for all people to have a direct share in the government of the country. Hence, people found it expedient to exercise their sovereign will, through their representatives periodically elected by them. This type of government by representatives has been hailed by political scientists like Mill, who proclaim that it is the highest ideal of policy.

When this principle of representative government entered the field of political theories, there was the rise of the democratic ideal in several countries. In a democracy, the ultimate sovereign authority are the people themselves, and here again, people elect their

representatives to govern the country, in their name and on their behalf. Hence the principle of Representative Democracy has played a conspicuous part in practical politics till recently.

INDICATIONS OF FAILURE

But it has been on its trial during the last two decades and democracies, as they have been existing in various countries of the world, have ignobly failed. At the present moment, all the major countries, with the exception of the United States, have practically denied democracy. If England is fighting resolutely to-day, it is because the familiar democratic institutions have ceased to exist. But there is a real democracy and unified government, which is thoroughly patriotic, even though all party interests are sacrificed. Democracy, as understood in text-books and patronised and propagated by professional politicians has really gone.

The rise of dictatorships and class governments based upon force, as can be seen from Germany, Russia, Italy, and several states in central and eastern Europe, the advocacy of direct action, the attack on parliamentarism by theoretical writers like G. D. H. Cole,—all these clearly point out the tendencies of failure.

INADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

Indeed, the state is now recognised as a social-service institution and not merely as a police institution. There are several parties at the present time, radically differing from one another, even on fundamentals. To add to this, we have class warfare. Finally there is great need for speed at the present time.

Things have to be decided at the time and on the spot. As it is, our experience shows that representative democracy is not able to tackle any of the problems successfully.

CAUSES FOR THE BREAK DOWN OF THE MACHINERY

The parts of the machinery are (a) voters, (b) Representative, (c) Party and (d) The agencies that influence public opinion. We shall examine how each factor has failed to achieve the objects which were expected of it.

VOTER

The successful working of Representative Democracy depends upon the interest that the generality of the population evinces in the affairs of the country. They must know who can and will represent their will in the legislature. Indeed, they must be educated so as to watch the activities of their legislators. They are to exercise their vote independently without any external interferences and sinister influences. Experience has shown that none of these requisites has come to be realised in the actual working of representative democracies in several countries in view of the incapacity and ignorance or insufficient mental qualities of the electorate. Indeed the functions of governments have become too complicated to be understood by the average voter.

REPRESENTATIVE

Unfortunately we have the failure of representation also. The representatives are, in theory, expected to be very conscientious of their duties and responsibilities. They are to be competent and incorruptible,

if they have to discharge their obligations in the right manner. Indeed, representation is based upon territory in several countries and this leads to only majority rule. It may appear to be strange to observe that in one general election, 534,839 Republican voters secured 164 seats in the Parliament, while 550,258 democratic voters could secure only 161 seats. In the general election of 1924, even though the Liberal Party was entitled to at least 100 seats in the Parliament, as three million votes were recorded in their favour, it could actually get only 39 seats. It is nothing but majority rule. Even though they have a narrow majority, they control the destinies of the country. The representatives then, can never be said to represent the electorate truly. That is why it has been found that in actual practice, persons of experience, character and ability are not able to enter the legislatures. This is on account of the rise of the party system.

PARTY SYSTEM

We find rigid organization of political parties at the present time and any one who wishes to succeed in public life must necessarily owe his allegiance to one party or other. The work of modern governments has become so large and complicated, that the generality of population, cannot understand the intricacies of administration. They can at best consider the programmes of parties and vote for their party candidate. It is the parties that nominate the candidates and the electorate is only a registering body. Even if a member succeeds, he goes to the legislature not in his individual capacity but as the member of a political party. At the time of voting, all the members vote in a body.

In countries, where we are having the cabinet government, we find that the members represent the majority party. The minority may oppose them but it is of no use. Nothing can be done without the support and co-operation of the cabinet. In England, the Parliament registers, as it were, the dictates of the Cabinet.

Here again, we can clearly see the failure of the party government. We should not believe that democracy without the party system cannot function. The British Government to-day is a democratic body but is not functioning as a party government. France, the vanguard of civilisation in the western world, was destroyed by party government. When interests of the country required one thing, and the interests of the party another thing, it led to treachery, not necessarily calculated treachery but unconscious treachery.

PUBLIC OPINION

Even public opinion is not alive to the situation. The agencies that influence public opinion are all controlled by vested interests, who give no chance to others to express their views, without fear or favour. As Professor Laski says "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." But public opinion is neither public nor is it opinion at all.

It will be seen that the expectations formed in regard to the ability and intelligence are not fulfilled in actual practice. The political parties and the agencies that influence public opinion, are indeed put to much abuse.

NEED FOR EXPERT KNOWLEDGE

The need for expert knowledge in the working of

modern governments can never be underestimated. It has been found that the actual part played by the representative Assembly, becomes less and less with the increasing complexity of governmental functions. That is why we say the bureaucracy, which Lord Hewart calls, "The New Despotism" is actually ruling England. Many of the good intentions of the legislators may be actually frustrated, in actual practice, by statutory orders and that is the reason why the bureaucracy is supreme in all lands.

GROWTH OF OUTSIDE AGENCIES

The growth of outside agencies influencing public opinion, etc. has reduced the Parliament to the position of a registering agency. But still the forms of debate, etc. are all kept up in the parliament.

GROWTH OF THE SOCIALISTIC SPIRIT

More fundamental than all this is the growth of the socialistic ideal. Indeed, we have the failure of the Economic order. Democracy has two sides, political and economic. Hitherto we had only political democracy and on the economic side, there was no social justice at all. A considerable measure of socialism, so far as the industrial wealth of the country is concerned, is necessary. The plain question that remains to be answered is, "Is it possible to transform the economic foundations of society by constitutional means ? Is not force necessary to establish the socialist order ?" This is indeed a negation of representative democracy or government by discussion. Indeed, it has been recognised that we must have a just social order based upon economic justice.

Thus, the tendency has been towards the concen-

tration of all authority in the hands of one man as in the case of dictators or in the hands of few individuals under the constitutional name cabinet, as can be seen from the History of England.

IS THE PRINCIPLE FUNDAMENTALLY DEFECTIVE ?

Representative Government has not fulfilled the expectations and virtues expected of it. It has failed to give the benefits, which its advocates expected. Before we proclaim its failure, we must also consider whether it is fundamentally defective. The optimists overvalued its moral advantages and the pessimists undervalued its practical advantages. Even a dictator has to respect public opinion. Leadership in representative democracy naturally passes to men of boldness, persuasive speech and energy.

FAILURE OF FALSE DEMOCRACY

The failure is only of that false democracy which professional politicians had been installing in the place of true democracy. Democratic ideal can never fail, if it is embodied in a new working form. It can surely bring about greater prosperity and happiness to the world. Dictatorship is only a passing phase in the political evolution of the state, as our experience of the ancient city-states goes to prove. Though it has not fulfilled its expectations, yet we can say that it has not outlived its usefulness since even a dictator has to heed public opinion if he is to succeed. The dramatic exit of Mussolini from Rome exemplifies the foregoing statement. Indeed, patriotism should be the motive power in a country.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS ON GOVERNMENT IN A DEMOCRACY

The government of a democratic country should have its tenure of office secured for at least 5 years. It should be removed only by a specific vote of no confidence passed by at least 2/3 of the total strength of the legislature. The voters should select representatives from a panel approved by a quasi-judicial body. This body will consider the qualifications, merits and the antecedents of the candidates. The press also should be non-partisan, in its outlook.

So we conclude, that without faith, nothing is accomplished, hope is the mainspring of faith. Representative Democracy alone can fulfill the expectations of the people ; it alone survives over other forms of polity.